## UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 03-6312

DAVID HENRY GINWRIGHT, JR.,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

PATRICK CONROY, Warden; ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR THE STATE OF MARYLAND,

Respondents - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. Peter J. Messitte, District Judge. (CA-02-231-PJM)

Submitted: June 19, 2003 Decided: June 24, 2003

Before NIEMEYER, KING, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

David Henry Ginwright, Jr., Appellant Pro Se. John Joseph Curran, Jr., Attorney General, Mary Ann Rapp Ince, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MARYLAND, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

## PER CURIAM:

David Henry Ginwright seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his motion filed under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2000). A certificate of appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) (2000). A prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that his constitutional claims are debatable and that any dispositive procedural rulings by the district court are also debatable or wrong. <u>See Miller-El v. Cockrell</u>, 123 S. Ct. 1029, 1040 (2003); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); Rose v. Lee, 252 F.3d 676, 683 (4th Cir.), cert. denied, 534 U.S. 941 (2001). independently reviewed the record and conclude that Ginwright has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED